

REMARKS

Examiner's Response to Arguments

Applicant traverses the Examiner's objection to the Applicant's drawing revisions. The Examiner misapplies 35 USC 132 in finding that Applicant's drawing revisions comprise new matter. The Examiner is directed to MPEP 706.03(o) New Matter. It is clear that new matter must be matter which is added to the application after the filing date of the application. Here, Applicant has not added any information to the application beyond that which was present in the application when it was originally filed. Rather, Applicant has corrected an error in the legend which appeared on Figures 1 and 2 to make these figures consistent with the specification. In this regard, the Examiner is referred to page 7, line 5 through page 9, line 23 in the application as originally filed. At no point in this discussion does the Applicant refer to such information as comprising prior art. It is therefore appropriate that the Examiner withdraw this objection. Applicant has added nothing new to the application.

The Examiner has addressed the Applicant's arguments traversing the Yared reference. Applicant does not dispute the Examiner's understanding of Yared. Rather, the Examiner appears to have a misconception with regard to the nature of Applicant's invention. Yared provides a prior art single sign-on system. Figure 9, referred to by the Examiner, shows that an identity provider may provide a point of access to multiple service providers. Applicant discusses single sign-on systems in connection with the background discussion section of the specification in the present patent application. Yared is just this type of system. For example, Yared [0117] states that "This configuration allows a user to authenticate with multiple service providers..."

In contrast to Yared, the claimed invention concerns a method for establishing an affiliation within a single sign-on system. The claimed invention presupposes a single

sign-on system, such as that provided by Yared. What applicant adds is a method for establishing one or more affiliations within such single sign on system.

To clarify this aspect of the invention, Applicant has amended Claim 9 to indicate that the owner comprises "a shared point of access for said service provider..." In such system, "trust is established with the user at said shared point of access for purposes of authentication and authorization, even if said point of access does not share, authentication requirements, by the virtue of said affiliation between said service providers at said point of access." Support for this claim amendment is found, at least, on page 6, lines 1 – 7.

Specification

The objections raised by the Examiner in connection with the specification are traversed. The Examiner is referred to Applicant's remarks above in connection with the drawings. No matter has been added to the application and any such rejection is improper.

Drawings

The Examiner is referred to Applicant's remarks above in connection with the drawings. No new matter has been added to the application. Any such rejection is improper.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended Claims 11, 15, and 25 in view of the Examiner's objections to these claims. Accordingly, these objections are deemed moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph

Applicant has amended Claims 9, 10, 18, and 26 to strike offending language identified by the Examiner therefrom. As such, the rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph is deemed moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph

Likewise, Applicant strikes from the claims the language identified as offending of 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph by the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 is deemed moot.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 101

Applicant has canceled Claim 26, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 102

Applicant has discussed this rejection above. The Examiner is referred to page 1 of the specification, where Applicant describes single sign-on services, such as that taught by Yared. However, as noted above, Yared does not address the creation of an affiliation that comprises a group of service providers that have chosen to act as a single entity for purposes of authentication federation, and authorization. This is an extension of the single sign on metaphor. Yared is entirely silent with regard to such affiliations. Yared does not teach the concept of an owner of an affiliation as claimed, nor does Yared teach a shared point of access that is provided by such owner.

As noted above, Yared's identity provider (Figure 9) merely teaches the linking of multiple service provider accounts. This is not the same thing as Applicant's claimed affiliation. Yared's identity provider is not analogous to Applicant's owner. Yared's

identity provider merely provides single sign-on capability to multiple service providers. There is no notion of a common identity for a plurality of service providers. Applicant's invention provides an owner of an affiliation in which each of the service providers in the affiliation collectively act as though they are a single entity on the network. This is not taught or suggested by Yared. Accordingly, Yared fails to teach every element of the claimed invention and is improperly cited as an anticipating reference under 35 USC 102. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No 22,862